



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,859	11/24/2003	Craig L. Reding	03-1013	5176
32127	7590	10/05/2005	EXAMINER	
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			ANWAH, OLISA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/720,859

Applicant(s)

REDING ET AL.

Examiner

Olisa Anwah

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 63 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 63 is objected to because the term "audio steam" in line 11 lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8, 12, 13, 23-32, 36-40, 42-48, 52, 53, 63-72, 76-83, 85 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0169330 (hereinafter Ben-Shachar) in view of Dalal et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014488 (hereinafter Dalal).

Regarding claim 1, Ben-Shachar teaches a method comprising:

Art Unit: 2645

establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users (paragraph 0053);

providing the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices (320 from Figure 3a) and

storing data contained in the audio stream (325).

Ben-Shachar fails to teach selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing.

Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

With regards to claim 2, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

With regards to claim 3, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

With regards to claim 4, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

Art Unit: 2645

With regards to claim 5, see Figure 3a of Ben-Shachar.

With regards to claim 6, see Figure 1a of Ben-Shachar.

With regards to claim 7, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

With regards to claim 8, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

As per claim 12, see 366 of Ben-Shachar.

With regards to claim 13, see paragraphs 0039-0041 of Dalal.

Regarding claim 23, Ben-Shachar teaches a method comprising:

establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for a stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users (paragraph 0053);

providing the stream to the plurality of destination devices (320 from Figure 3a);

storing data contained in the stream (325) and

replaying, at at least one of the destination devices, a selected portion of the stream (366).

Art Unit: 2645

Ben-Shachar fails to teach determining whether a user has exited the conference call; and selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing.

Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 24, Ben-Shachar teaches a method comprising:

establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);
providing an audio stream corresponding to the conference call to a plurality of destination devices (320 from Figure 3a)
and storing data contained in the audio stream (325)

Ben-Shachar fails to teach selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing.

Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As

Art Unit: 2645

a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 25, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 26, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 27, see Figure 3 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 28, see Figure 1a of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 29, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 30, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 31, Ben-Shachar teaches a method comprising:

receiving, from a service center, an audio stream corresponding to a conference call between a plurality of users including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

storing data contained in the received audio stream (325)
and

wherein the service center establishes the conference call between the plurality of users, ascertains identities of a plurality of destination devices for the audio stream

Art Unit: 2645

corresponding to the conference call, and provides the audio stream data to the plurality of destination devices (paragraph 0053).

Ben-Shachar fails to explain determining whether a user has exited the conference call and selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 32, see Figure 1 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 36, see 366 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 37, see paragraphs 0039-0041 of Dalal.

Regarding claim 38, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 39, see Figure 1 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 40, see Figure 3c of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 41, Ben-Shachar teaches a system comprising:

means for establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

means for ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users (paragraph 0053);

means for providing the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices (320 from Figure 3a) and

means for storing data contained in the audio stream (325).

Ben-Shachar fails to teach means for determining whether a user has exited the conference call and means for selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claim 42, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 43, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 44, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 45, see Figure 1 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 46, see Figure 1a of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 47, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 48, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 52, see 366 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 53, see paragraphs 0039-0041 of Dalal.

Regarding claim 63, Ben-Shachar teaches a system comprising:

means for establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

means for ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for a stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users (paragraph 0053);

means for providing the stream to the plurality of destination devices (320 from Figure 3a) and

means for storing data contained in the stream (325).

Art Unit: 2645

Ben-Shachar fails to teach means for selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 64, Ben-Shachar teaches an apparatus comprising:

means for establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

means for providing an audio stream corresponding to the conference call to a plurality of destination devices, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users (320 from Figure 3a) and

means for storing data contained in the stream (325).

Ben-Shachar fails to teach determining whether a user has exited the conference call; and selectively deleting the stored

Art Unit: 2645

audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing.

Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 65, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 66, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 67, see Figure 3a of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 68, see Figure 1a of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 69, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 70, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 71, Ben-Shachar teaches an apparatus comprising:

means for receiving, from a service center, an audio stream corresponding to a conference call between a plurality of users including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

means for storing data contained in the received audio stream (325) and

wherein the service center establishes the conference call between the plurality of users, ascertains identities of a plurality of destination devices for the audio stream corresponding to the conference call, and provides the audio stream data to the plurality of destination devices (paragraph 0053).

Ben-Shachar fails to show determining whether a user has exited the conference call and selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 72, see Figure 1 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 76, see 366 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 77, see paragraphs 0039-0041 of Dalal.

Regarding claim 78, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 79, see Figures 1-3 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 80, see Figure 3c of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 81, Ben-Shachar teaches a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing a method comprising:

establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users (paragraph 0053);

providing the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices (320 from Figure 3a) and

storing data contained in the audio stream (325).

Ben-Shachar fails to teach determining whether a user has exited the conference call and selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing.

Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would

Art Unit: 2645

have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 82, Ben-Shachar teaches a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing a method comprising:

establishing a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

providing an audio stream corresponding to the conference call to a plurality of destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users (320 from Figure 3a) and

storing data contained in the audio stream (325).

Ben-Shachar fails to teach determining whether a user has exited the conference call and selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing.

Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 83, Ben-Shachar teaches a computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing a method comprising:

receiving, from a service center, an audio stream corresponding to a conference call between a plurality of users including an initiating user (paragraph 0074);

storing data contained in the received audio stream (325) and

wherein the service center establishes the conference call between the plurality of users, ascertains identities of a plurality of destination devices for the audio stream corresponding to the conference call, and provides the audio stream data to the plurality of destination devices (paragraph 0053).

Ben-Shachar fails to teach determining whether a user has exited the conference call and selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing.

Nonetheless, Dalal shows these features (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would

Art Unit: 2645

have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 85, Ben-Shachar discloses an apparatus comprising:

a first server operable to establish a conference call between a plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), including an initiating user (paragraph 0074), and to ascertain identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call (paragraph 0053), the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users;

a second server operable to provide the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices (320); and

a memory that stores data contained in the audio stream (325).

Ben-Shachar fails to teach the stored audio stream data is selectively deleted based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. Nonetheless, Dalal shows this procedure (see paragraph 0041). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ben-Shachar with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This

Art Unit: 2645

modification would have improved the efficiency of Ben-Shachar by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

Regarding claim 86, Ben-Shachar shows an apparatus comprising:

a memory having a program that: receives, from a service center, an audio stream corresponding to a conference call between a plurality of users including an initiating user (paragraph 0074); stores data contained in the received audio stream (325); replays a selected portion of the audio stream data (366), wherein the service center establishes the conference call between the plurality of users (20A, 20B, 20C), ascertains identities of a plurality of destination devices for the audio stream corresponding to the conference call (paragraph 0053), and provides the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices (320) and a processor that runs the program.

4. Claims 16-22 and 56-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar in view of Schoof II, U.S. Patent No. 5,440,624 (hereinafter Schoof).

Regarding claim 16, Ben-Shachar discloses a method comprising:

Art Unit: 2645

establishing a conference call between a plurality of users, including an initiating user;

ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users;

providing the audio stream to at least one of the plurality of destination devices and

storing data contained in the audio stream.

Ben-Shachar miserably fails to explain replaying a selected portion of the stored audio stream data, while the conference call is ongoing. However Schoof discloses this puzzling complicated mystery (see column 4). Consequently it would have been apparent to an individual of plain ability in the field to alter Ben-Shachar with the replaying feature of Schoof. This modification would have improved the convenience of Ben-Shachar by allowing a conference participant to clarify details at anytime during an ongoing conference as stipulated by Ben-Shachar.

As per claim 17, see paragraph 0053 of Ben-Shachar.

As per claim 18, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Art Unit: 2645

As per claim 19, see Figure 1b of Ben-Shachar.

As per claim 20, see Figure 1a of Ben-Shachar.

As per claim 21, see Figure 3c of Ben-Shachar.

As per claim 22, see Figure 3c of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 56, Ben-Shachar discloses a system comprising:

means for establishing a conference call between a plurality of users, including an initiating user;

means for ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users;

means for providing the audio stream to at least one of the plurality of destination devices and

means for storing data contained in the audio stream.

Ben-Shachar miserably fails to explain the claimed means for replaying a selected portion of the stored audio stream data, while the conference call is ongoing. However Schoof discloses this puzzling complicated mystery (see column 4). Consequently it would have been apparent to an individual of

Art Unit: 2645

plain ability in the field to alter Ben-Shachar with the replaying feature of Schoof. This modification would have improved the convenience of Ben-Shachar by allowing a conference participant to clarify details at anytime during an ongoing conference as stipulated by Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 57, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 58, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 59, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 60, see Figure 1a of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 61, see paragraph 0054 of Ben-Shachar.

Regarding claim 62, see Figure 3c of Ben-Shachar.

5. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar combined with Schoof in further view of Dalal.

On the issue of claim 84, Ben-Shachar teaches a system comprising:

a service center operable to establish a conference call between a plurality of users, including an initiating user, and to ascertain identities of a plurality of destination devices

Art Unit: 2645

for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users;

an audio streaming server operable to provide the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices; and

a memory that stores data contained in the audio stream.

Ben-Shachar doesn't explicitly explain at least one of the destination devices is operable to replay a selected portion of the audio stream data, while the conference call is ongoing. However Schoof discloses this puzzling complicated mystery (see column 4). Consequently it would have been apparent to an individual of plain ability in the field to alter Ben-Shachar with the replaying feature of Schoof. This modification would have improved the convenience of Ben-Shachar by allowing a conference participant to clarify details at anytime during an ongoing conference as stipulated by Ben-Shachar.

The combination of Ben-Shachar and Schoof miserably fails to explain the stored audio steam data is selectively deleted based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. However Schoof discloses this puzzling complicated mystery (see column 4). Consequently it would have been apparent to an individual of

Art Unit: 2645

plain ability in the field to further alter the combination of Ben-Shachar and Schoof with the deleting limitation of Dalal. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by freeing resources as suggested by Dalal.

6. Claims 9-11, 33-35, 49-51 and 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar combined Dalal in further view of Schoof.

On the issue of claim 9, nowhere does the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal indicate playing a section of the stored audio stream data for a user-selected portion of time. Yet, Schoof teaches this limitation (observe column 10). Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal with the playback mode of Schoof. This modification would have improved the user friendliness by allowing a participant to playback those portions of the conference record where a particular participant or group of participants spoke or communicated as suggested by Schoof.

On the issue of claim 10, nowhere does the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal indicate the claimed playing limitation.

Art Unit: 2645

Yet, Schoof teaches this limitation (observe column 10). Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal with the playback mode of Schoof. This modification would have improved the user friendliness by allowing a participant to playback those portions of the conference record where a particular participant or group of participants spoke or communicated as suggested by Schoof.

On the issue of claim 11, nowhere does the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal indicate the claimed playing limitation. Yet, Schoof teaches this limitation (observe column 10). Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal with the playback mode of Schoof. This modification would have improved the user friendliness by allowing a participant to playback those portions of the conference record where a particular participant or group of participants spoke or communicated as suggested by Schoof.

Claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9.

Claim 34 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11.

Claim 49 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9.

Claim 50 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 51 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11.

Claim 73 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9.

Claim 74 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 75 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11.

7. Claims 14, 15, 54 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar combined Dalal in further view of Caspi et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0249884 (hereinafter Caspi).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal does not disclose the claimed playing limitation. Nonetheless Caspi teaches this limitation (see paragraph 0009). Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal with the playing function of Caspi. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by allowing a reviewing party to review relevant portions of the conference as suggested by Caspi.

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal does not disclose the claimed recording limitation. Nonetheless Caspi teaches this limitation (see paragraph 0009). Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Ben-Shachar and Dalal with the recording function of Caspi. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by allowing a reviewing party to review relevant portions of the conference as suggested by Caspi.

Claim 54 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14.

Claim 55 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant incorrectly alleges Dalal does not teach selectively deleting the stored audio stream based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. Dalal deletes a conference after all the participants have left (see paragraph 0041). Thus, Dalal selectively deletes a conference based on a determination that the last participant has exited the conference call, while the conference call is ongoing. For this reason, the Examiner cannot allow the claims as presently claimed.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

Art Unit: 2645

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

O.A.

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
September 22, 2005


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000